

# RACE: REALITY AND DENIAL

RICHARD McCULLOCH

---

**M**oviegoers who saw *Cats and Dogs* when it played in theaters during its summer 2001 release were subjected to an advertisement, shown before the previews, that boldly proclaimed, "Wake up. Race is a myth. Racism is real. [www.endracism.org](http://www.endracism.org)." The effect was surreal. How could this Orwellian falsehood be on the screen? Examples of racial denial have been around for a while, but mostly on the fringes, in obscure publications inaccessible to the masses. But such a blatantly ideological message on the silver screen indicates the extent to which anti-racial egalitarian propaganda has become so mainstream, so acceptable, and so normal.

Racially conscious Americans of Northern European ancestry, who love their race and seek its preservation, have long been concerned by its declining prospects. But moviegoers could very well wonder whether the continued existence of their race seemed more uncertain than ever, for nothing is more certain than that the political purpose of race denial is to become a self-fulfilling prophecy and cause the end, if not of every race, most certainly of Northern Europeans. How can our racial existence, the continued survival of our kinship, which many wish to preserve, be so flagrantly denied in this mainstream setting? How can it be possible that middle-American audiences are exposed to such a powerful and destructive message? That the object of our love and devotion does not exist, is not real, and that it is not acceptable to believe that it does exist? How did this come to pass?

The denial of racial realities is nothing new. It has been around at least since the time of Franz Boas. It is the *degree* of denial that is new. Denying racial reality has taken many forms over the last century, escalating in degree as the cultural dominance and control of its promoters has grown. Denial of racial differences has taken many forms over the years, especially denial of mental differences that cannot be seen but only measured indirectly. There has been denial of the scope and magnitude of racial differences in an attempt to minimize them, and denial of the consequences of multiracial conditions, particularly racial intermixture and its racially destructive effects. Now it is the very reality and existence of the different races, of tangible things that can be seen, that is denied.

Given the history of escalating race denial over the preceding century, we should have expected this development; we should have seen it coming. Perhaps when first encountering a claim that races were not real, we incredulously dismissed it as nonsense not worthy of concern or response, as

something no one would take seriously. But we should have taken it seriously. Now it is approaching a position of politically correct dominance in the media and academia, with all that that means. *The very belief in the existence of different races is now in some quarters being equated with racism, and thereupon reductionist logic and causation link it ultimately with genocide.* In such quarters they beg their argument by explicitly stating that the reality of race must be denied in order to end racism and prevent genocide.<sup>1</sup> (A number of discussions, debates or arguments concerning the reality of race are posted on my website [www.racialcompact.com] and have appeared there since it was launched on the Internet in early 1998. Some of my arguments with race deniers have been direct, one-on-one exchanges. These have usually ended after my antagonists explicitly admitted their support, and even their desire, for Northern European extinction.<sup>2</sup>)

The arguments used to deny the reality of race usually follow a similar pattern. The race deniers begin with attempts to discredit the traditional methods of racial classification, especially racial typology based on phenotype or physical appearance, the combination of all one's physical traits. Next they attempt to discredit the traditional racial divisions that are based on these methods of classification.

The purpose of this is to create confusion, ambiguity, and uncertainty about race. A definition of race is usually lacking from the race deniers' argument, either because they do not know how to define it, or because they know that an accurate definition of race would refute their argument. Finally, when enough confusion and ambiguity have been created, they merely reject the concept of race. But if you press the matter it usually becomes clear that the real issue for them is not the methods of racial classification, nor even the reality of races—the apparent focus of their argument—but the issue of *racial preservation*, and especially the issue of *Northern European racial preservation*. So when all is said and done, the ultimate issue is the same for race deniers as it is for racial preservationists: the continued existence of Northern European peoples and their racial types. The difference is that deniers are against the continued existence of the *racial distinctiveness* that differentiates Northern European peoples from other populations, whereas preservationists favor the survival of these racial traits and qualities.

A common tactic of race deniers is to demand proof of the reality of race, without setting a standard of what constitutes *sufficient* proof. Their standards of proof are artificially too high. This is related to their avoidance of an objective or accurate definition of race. Proof begins with an accurate definition, and it is the key to an effective refutation of race denial arguments. So, what is this thing called race?

To start at the beginning, the word race refers to the different geographic populations of humanity that share a common ancestry and can be distinguished from each other by an inherited combination of morphological

traits, i.e., by genetically determined physical appearance or *phenotypes*. Race thus refers both to *populations* and to the *phenotypes* that are associated with these populations and by which they are identified. These populations and phenotypes existed for many thousands of years before the word race became the common term to refer to them. Thus the definition of the word race is, quite simply, those populations and phenotypes to which it refers.

This is, admittedly, circular logic, like Gertrude Stein's "a rose is a rose is a rose." But the existence and reality of things that are tangible, material, physical, and visible, that are clearly obvious to operable senses, are normally accepted as self-evident and not requiring external proof, as the proof is self-contained in such things themselves. Reasonable people do not question their existence or require proof of their reality based on some arbitrary standard. If the existence of something is denied, and the object is presented, its existence must be admitted. To deny the existence of something that is visibly present is unreasonable. The object that is dismissed by race deniers—the actuality of race—is visibly present in abundance, both for individuals and for populations, far beyond any reasonable requirement.

### THE EVIDENCE FOR RACIAL REALITY

But if more proof is asked for, what kind of proof is required for the reality of race? What standard of proof is reasonable? If concrete proof is not enough, and the proof of abstract logic is required, the best proof is a convergence of proofs—proofs from different and independent lines of evidence that converge in mutual and consistent support for the same conclusion. Some of the convergent lines of evidence consistent in mutually supporting the reality of race include: geography, history, phenotype, evolutionary theory, forensic science, and, most recently, genetic studies.

*Races are geographically real.* As such, races constitute geographical *populations* with a geographic distribution. These distinct populations were, until recent times, geographically separated from other races. Their origin and existence are connected to a specific geographic region they have historically inhabited. The connection of geography and race is seen in the strong correlation between the *degree of racial difference* and the *geographic distance separating the original habitats* of the different races. The geographic connection is important because races are breeding populations that form a common gene pool and stable racial environment over many generations, and before modern transportation advances this required that the native homeland of the race be geographically limited and compact. The continuation or preservation of the race also required geographic separation from other racial elements to prevent intermixture or replacement that would alter or destroy the race. This meant that other races had to be excluded from its geographic range, that its possession of its native homeland had to be racially exclusive. This exclusivity did not have to be total or absolute, but sufficient to create and preserve the race.

Although migrations of racial elements outside of their original homelands have occurred, especially in the last five centuries, often intermixing with other races to create intermediate forms, the populations that remain in the original homelands act as control groups or standards of reference for racial classification and study. Emigrant populations that expanded the geographic range of their race into new habitats, and restricted their reproduction within their own race, continued to be of the same race as those in the native homelands, and in their racial heritage and origins they remained identified with those homelands. These geographic populations are facts on the ground, existing in the real world, in their own part of the world exactly where one would expect to find them, there for all to see. They are facts that can be observed and measured as part of objective reality, marked by their distinguishing physical characteristics or racial phenotype. *National Geographic* magazine, in its long history of publication, has published countless articles that irrefutably document the geographic connection, distribution, and reality of race.

*Races are historically real.* The major races of Europe, Asia, and Africa that we know today, as well as many of their subraces, are documented in the written historical record from its beginning over three thousand years ago, and in the artistic record over a thousand years earlier. The races of the Americas, Australia, and the Pacific entered the historical record from the moment when the first Western explorers found them. From the dawn of history to our own time the existence, geographic location, distinguishing physical features, and movements of these races have been a recognizable part of the historical record. Races are also prehistorically real. Modern prehistorians, anthropologists, and archaeologists have pushed our knowledge of the modern races back thousands of years before the beginnings of written history. It is clear that the races we know today have existed, in a continuum of generations, for many thousands of years.

*Races are phenotypically real.* Phenotype, the physical part of race that we can see, and so must admit that race is at least that if nothing more, is tangibly and visibly real. It is also the visible proof that race is inherited, that it is genetically transmitted from generation to generation with scientific consistency and predictability. This means that race is genetically real. It is determined by *different combinations of genes*, hence a physical trait that is *polygenic* in nature, and thus race is in fact genetically determined, which means that race is a biological phenomenon and biologically real.

Phenotype—the genetically inherited and determined traits of physical appearance—is also the definitive racial identifier used to classify race. Every race has a certain range of different phenotypes, or racial elements, within its population. But there is no phenotypic overlap between the major racial divisions of humanity. If you took three groups of one hundred individuals each from Nigeria, England, and China—with each group being representative

of its native populations—the average person would have no difficulty identifying which group was which. Even if they were all mixed together, the average person would have no difficulty separating them by phenotype into their correct racial category with complete accuracy. However, phenotypic overlap is often found between the racial subdivisions within the major racial divisions. If you took three groups of one hundred individuals each from three different subdivisions of the Caucasian racial division, represented by England, Italy, and Syria—with each group being representative of its native populations—the average person would again have no difficulty identifying which group was which. Although there would be some phenotypic overlap between the English and Italian groups, and between the Italian and Syrian groups, each group would contain a large majority of phenotypes that would be rare or absent from the other groups. If the groups were mixed together the average person would probably be less than completely accurate in separating the English from the Italians, or the Italians from the Syrians, but it is likely that he would be completely accurate in separating the English from the Syrians. Phenotype proves that race is real. But it also illustrates to some extent that race is a continuum, marked by many subdivisions with subtle gradations of racial change that correlate with spatial and temporal distance.

*Evolutionary theory supports the reality of human races.* It assumes that the extent of biological variation within a species correlates with the extent of its geographic range. The greater the geographic range, the greater the degree of biological variation. *Race is biological variation.* The human species has had a hemispheric geographic range for perhaps 100,000 years and a global geographic range for at least 10,000 years, and displays the high degree of biological variation that evolutionary theory expects and predicts from such a widely distributed population. Biological variation is the driving force behind evolution and the creation of new species. It is caused by the separation of populations by geographic distance or barriers. It would be inconsistent with evolutionary theory if the human species, with its unsurpassed level of geographical population separation, did not display a highly developed degree of biological variation, developing or evolving into different races. There is a logical progression to evolution. It is continuous, from phylum to class to order to family to genus to species to race. It does not stop with species. It creates races, which develop in turn into new species. Race is the evolutionary stage of a population before it becomes a different species. To deny it is to claim that evolution has stopped.

*Forensic science supports the reality of the human races.* Forensic scientists can identify race from skeletal remains with great accuracy, as described by forensic scientist George Gill:

The “reality of race”. . . depends more on the definition of reality than on the definition of race. If we choose to accept the system of racial taxonomy that physical anthropologists have traditionally established—major races: black,

white, etc.— then one can classify human skeletons within it just as well as one can living humans. The bony traits of the nose, mouth, femur, and cranium are just as revealing to a good osteologist as skin color, hair form, nose form, and lips to the perceptive observer of living humanity. I have been able to prove to myself over the years, in actual legal cases, that I am more accurate at assessing race from skeletal remains than from looking at living people standing before me. So those of us in forensic anthropology know that the skeleton reflects race, whether “real” or not, just as well if not better than superficial soft tissue does. The idea that race is “only skin deep” is simply not true, as any experienced forensic anthropologist will affirm.<sup>3</sup>

*Genetics is the newest branch of evidence to support the reality of race.* Ironically, genetics is the line of evidence that race deniers favor—in fact it is often the only one they will accept—in the belief that it supports their contention that race is merely a “social construct.” In reality, and in spite of the obligatory protestations to the popular press by geneticists to the contrary, *race is a genetically determined physical trait.* There are also many genetic differences between the races in genes that are not determinative of race. There are countless genetic studies that show racial differences in the frequencies of different gene sequences and genetic traits, although the term “population” is commonly used as a euphemism for race.

The primary reason that race deniers claim that genetics proves that race is not real is the *percentage* of genetic differences *between* the races. They claim that the percentages are too small to constitute different races or, to put it another way, that the variation gap among *Homo sapiens* is too narrow to legitimately justify the concept of race. They do not say what standard is applied to determine what percentage of genetic difference is required to constitute a race, only that the difference between human populations is too small. But no percentage of genetic difference has ever been asserted as a basis for racial classification. Indeed, until the last two decades scientists and laymen alike had little idea what the percentage of genetic differences was between races, or between species. When they make this argument, race deniers do not mention that the genetic difference between humans and chimpanzees is also much smaller than the layman would tend to expect. Most genetic studies show a genetic difference of 1.5 to 1.7 percent between humans and chimpanzees, with the most commonly cited figure being 1.6 percent.<sup>4</sup> But this represents far more than the genetic difference between races. It is more than the genetic difference between species, and even more than the genetic difference between genera. It represents the *genetic difference between taxonomic families*, because humans and chimpanzees are in different biological families. Humans are in the family Hominidae (of which they are the only surviving species) and chimpanzees, the closest living relatives of our species, are in the family Pongidae.

What are the percentages of genetic differences between the human races? Perhaps the best study to date on this subject is that of Masatoshi Nei and Arun K. Roychoudhury (1993).<sup>5</sup> Nei and Roychoudhury use a different methodology than that of L.L. Cavalli-Sforza et al. (1988), which in their opinion “introduced unreasonable branching patterns into phylogenetic trees,” a reference to Cavalli-Sforza’s grouping of Northeast Asians in the same cluster with Caucasians rather than with Southern Chinese and Southeast Asians. The following percentages of genetic differences between populations and the phylogenetic tree below are from their study.


**PERCENTAGE OF GENETIC DISTANCE OF THE ENGLISH, JAPANESE, AND NIGERIAN POPULATIONS FROM OTHER POPULATIONS PER NEI AND ROYCHOU DHURY (1993)**

<i>English Distance</i>	<i>Japanese Distance</i>	<i>Nigerian Distance</i>
German .002	Korean .006	Bantu (Natal) .027
Finn .005	Mongolian .012	San-Bushmen .075
Italian .007	S. Chinese .023	Italian .130
North Indian .020	Filipino .026	German .131
Iranian .022	Thai .030	English .133
Lapp .025	Polynesian .035	Finn .133
Mongolian .055	North Indian .040	North Indian .135
Japanese .061	N. Amerind .042	Iranian .136
Korean .061	Iranian .050	Mongolian .141
S. Chinese .073	Finn .054	Korean .143
Filipino .074	Italian .055	Lapp .145
N. Amerind .076	German .057	Japanese .149
Thai .081	English .061	Filipino .150
Polynesian .096	Lapp .061	S. Chinese .155
San-Bushmen .097	Australoid .062	N. Amerind .158
Bantu (Natal) .108	San-Bushmen .108	Thai .161
Australoid .122	Bantu (Natal) .117	Polynesian .166
Nigerian .133	Nigerian .149	Australoid .176
Chimpanzee 1.60	Chimpanzee 1.60	Chimpanzee 1.60

If one were to spatially visualize the first column of the above scale, with a German standing at a distance of 20 feet from an Englishman, a Finn would stand at a distance of 50 feet, an Italian at 70 feet, a northern Indian at 200 feet, a Japanese at 610 feet, a North American Amerindian at 760 feet, a Nigerian at 1,330 feet, and a chimpanzee at 16,000 feet. The greatest percentage of genetic difference is .176 percent between Nigerians and Australian

Aborigines. This is 11 percent of the genetic difference of 1.6 percent between humans and chimpanzees, different biological families whose ancestral lines are believed to have separated 6-7 million years ago.<sup>6</sup> It is also worth noting that for both the English and the Japanese, representing Europeans and Northeast Asians, the greatest percentage of genetic difference is with the Nigerians, and that the degree of this difference, .133 percent for the English and .149 percent for the Japanese, is very similar. (The first split in the ancestral lines of the human races, that between Africans and non-Africans, is believed to have occurred 180-270 thousand years ago.) By comparison, the English and Japanese degree of difference from the Australian Aborigine population, .122 percent for the English and .062 percent for the Japanese, is very different, with the English-Australoid difference twice as great as the Japanese-Australoid difference.

The phylogenetic tree below—representative of 26 human populations from Nei and Roychoudhury (1993), which includes the following major population divisions: Africans (A), Caucasians (B), Greater Asians (C), Amerindians (D), and Australopapuans (E)—graphically illustrates the genetic relationships among different populations.



This phylogenetic tree illustrates how genetic studies group phylogenetic populations of humanity into superclusters and clusters that are consistent with the traditional racial divisions and subdivisions, providing genetic proof that race is real and traditional racial classifications are indeed accurate. The political statements made by geneticists to the popular press to the effect that their studies show that “race is not a valid scientific concept,” or that “race has no genetic or scientific basis,” should be seen in this context and perspective. Such politically motivated statements cast doubt on the integrity of the scientific process as practiced by these geneticists, tending to discredit their studies.

The cumulative effect of theses converging lines of evidence should make it clear beyond any reasonable doubt that race is real. But before we come to the conclusion that the claims of the race deniers are beyond reason, some of their more common arguments should be examined.

### ARGUMENTS FOR RACIAL DENIAL

1. *The genetic ignorance argument.* We do not yet know which genes or specific clusters of genes actually determine racial differences, or how they do it. Race deniers use this to claim that race is not genetically real. Yet no one can reasonably dispute that race consists of inherited traits, transmitted by parents to their children, and inherited traits must be genetic traits, as the only means known by science to transmit inherited traits is through the genes. Also, we do not yet know what genes are involved in causing many diseases that are known to be inherited, yet because we know they are inherited we know they are caused by genes, and the search for these genes is the purpose of most genetic studies.

2. *Argument by trivialization.* This argument admits the reality of population differences, both physical and genetic, but claims they are of no importance and are not great enough to qualify as racial differences. This argument attempts to make the issue of racial reality a subjective value judgment, and belittles the biological variation that exists between the diverse human populations as being of no value or importance, and not a legitimate matter for concern, love, or devotion. Basically, this argument asserts that the only human traits that are valuable or important are those traits shared by all humans in common, while racial differences, those traits that are unique to particular populations and not shared by all, are of no significance.

3. *Argument by false definition.* Race deniers frequently confuse race and species in their argument, setting a standard for race that is the same as the standard for species, implicitly applying the definition of species to race. Since humanity is one species, with no different human species, it is then argued by false definition that there are no different human races, defining race out of existence. The distinguishing difference between species and race, of course, is that species cannot interbreed, or at least do not interbreed under natural

conditions, while races can and do interbreed when there is extensive contact between them. Race deniers wrongly use the existence of hybrid or racially mixed individuals and populations, which prove that the different human populations interbreed and are therefore races rather than species, as proof that all humans are of one race, not different races, confusing race with species and defining race out of existence.

As one recent study states:

If biological is defined as genetic then . . . a decade or more of population genetics research has documented genetic, and therefore biological, differentiation among the races . . . [I]t is difficult to conceive of a definition of “biological” that does not lead to racial differentiation, except perhaps one as extreme as speciation.<sup>7</sup>

An example of the effort to define race out of existence can be found on the website of Palomar College.<sup>8</sup> It sets up a strawman, a false definition and very narrow and strict standard of what constitutes race, allowing it to deny the reality of race on the grounds that human variation does not meet that standard or definition:

Most physical anthropologists would agree that this human variation is not now sufficient to warrant defining separate biological races, varieties, or sub-species. However, it very likely was in our prehistoric past.

But if races did exist, were real, in our prehistoric past, when did they cease to exist and stop being real? What happened to them that caused them to no longer be races? How did it happen? When did it happen? What is the standard that determines what degree of human variation is sufficient to warrant defining separate biological races, for race to be considered to be real? When was this standard created, and who created it? What standard, if any, did it replace? Did the reality of race ever depend on a standard set by physical anthropologists? Was not the term “race” common usage to refer to identifiable populations and individuals, and defined as those identifiable populations and individuals, long before physical anthropology existed? And if the use of the term race to refer to identifiable populations and individuals predated the existence of physical anthropology, how and why should physical anthropologists presume to redefine it out of existence? Or is it not that races have changed, but that the racial composition of academia has changed, that classrooms, student bodies, campuses, and faculties have been multiracialized, and that this multiracial environment discourages any expression of racial consciousness and identity, even the belief that race is real, as racially divisive? So, how should race be defined?

As with other things that exist, an accurate definition of race is one that describes it as it is, as it *actually* is and *really* exists. The definitions of race in modern encyclopedias and dictionaries describe something real, race as it really is, and by those definitions race exists and is real. Race as a biological concept and the reality of racial differences have not changed. However, definitions of race have changed, as race deniers have attempted to change the definition of

race to redefine it out of existence. If race does exist as described in earlier standard definitions, but does not exist as described in the new definition of the race deniers, that means that the new definition is wrong and does not accurately describe the reality of race, not that race is not real. An accurate definition describes something as it is, not by some abstract concept of what it should be followed by a declaration that it does not exist when it does not match that concept. *Race is not an abstract concept but something that is tangibly and visibly real.* The race deniers who say they do not believe in the “concept” of race know this. They know what the common usage of the term race refers to, what the accurate definition of race is, and what we mean when we refer to race. They know what we are talking about, and they know it is real. But the race deniers are too clever by half. They know the only way they can deny race is to create a false definition under which race does not exist, and by which they can pretend to refute the reality of race. The reasons for their success in this argument, like their motives, are political, not scientific.

It should be noted that egalitarian academics who promote these political quasi-definitions, which deny the reality of race, typically avoid any discussion of the arguments put forth by John R. Baker in his landmark 1974 book *Race* when rejecting the conventional concept of race. In terms of establishing the meaning of “race,” the book offers a definitive treatment of the subject. Baker, who ranked among the foremost biological authorities as a cytologist at Oxford University and a Fellow of the Royal Society, recognized several fallacies that egalitarians devised in their attempt to undermine the biological realities of race, which he carefully pulverized in 625 pages of text, substantiated with 1181 references from the scientific literature. One important point that Baker addressed rebuts one strawman definition that the notion of “intermediates” invalidates the legitimacy of race,

It is sometimes claimed that the existence of intermediates makes races unreal. It scarcely needs to be pointed out, however, that in other matters no one questions the reality of categories between which intermediates exist. There is every gradation, for instance, between green and blue, but no one denies that these words should be used. In the same way the existence of youths and human hermaphrodites does not cause anyone to disallow the use of the words ‘boy,’ ‘man,’ and ‘woman.’ It is particularly unjustifiable to cite intermediates as contradicting the reality of races, for the existence of intermediates is one of the distinguishing characters of the race: if there are no intermediates, there are no races.<sup>9</sup>

4. *Argument by false methods of racial identification and classification.* Similar to number three above, this argument claims that the traditional typological methods of racial identification and classification based on morphological traits or phenotype are arbitrary. It contends that other methods would yield very different results, classifying different types—as measured by these different methods—into groupings that differ from the traditional racial groupings, making them meaningless and arbitrary. Blood groups, for

example, are not distributed in a manner that coincides with the traditional racial groupings. But the traditional methods of racial classification by racial typology or physical appearance are not arbitrary, for the simple reason that they are based on, reflect, and are consistent with the real geographic populations of humanity, as they really exist, and therefore with objectively observable and verifiable reality. They are the traits that differ between these real populations, the differences in physical appearance by which these populations can be accurately distinguished and identified, and by which they are and have been accurately distinguished and identified for millennia. Those traits that are not distributed in a manner that coincides with real populations are not valid methods of racial identification in the real world.

5. *The continuum and differentiation argument.* This is an argument based on the real complexity of race, that refutes the many simplistic concepts and systems of racial classification and then pretends that it has refuted the reality of race. The reality is that race is a complex of multiple continuums with gradations of intermediate, hybrid, or mixed types (called clines) between the distinct types at the ends of the continuums. These clines are geographically distributed in clinal zones located between the regions inhabited by the distinct types. Race deniers argue that these intermediate, mixed, or clinal types make scientifically accurate differentiation between the races impossible. Dividing lines between races in the intermediate ranges of the racial continuums are often difficult to determine and appear arbitrary, especially in simplistic classification systems that attempt to fit all human populations into a few major races. The race deniers exploit this complexity to discredit the accuracy of the simplistic classification systems and then deny the reality of the complexity. But the existence of continuums or clines, rather than disproving the reality of race, is actually a characteristic of race, and thus serves as proof of its reality. If there were no racial continuums or clines there would be no intermediate forms, no interbreeding between the races, and humanity would be divided into species rather than races. Without different races there could be no continuums or clines between them, so the existence of continuums is proof of the existence of races. As stated in the study cited above, “The existence of such intermediate groups should not . . . overshadow the fact that the greatest genetic structure that exists in the human population occurs at the racial level.”<sup>10</sup>

6. *The scientific obsolescence argument.* This argument claims that the idea of race is based on a false, outdated, and obsolete concept of science from a previous era, e.g., the “colonial era,” the seventeenth century, etc. In other words, it says that belief in race is backward, outdated, and “old-fashioned,” an adjective that has great weight with those who like to see themselves as advanced thinkers. It cites false beliefs or myths about race from those earlier eras that are easily refuted as proof of this claim, and by refuting these false beliefs pretends that it has refuted the reality of race. Every branch of science has suffered from many false beliefs and theories during its history. Physics,

biology, and medicine began in the sixth to fourth centuries B.C., and each has had a long history of false beliefs and theories, yet these sciences are still recognized as valid. They are not regarded as obsolete because of discarded false beliefs.

7. *The social or political construct argument.* Race deniers and deconstructionists often claim that race is a social or political construct that has no biological or genetic reality. This argument includes the claim that the idea of race was created in America, with the first contact of Europeans with other major races and the subsequent centuries of their political and social inequality, and that America exported its concept of race to Europe and the rest of the world. This argument (which shares some ideas with number six above) often gains credence from biologists and geneticists who try to avoid the political controversies surrounding race by claiming it is not relevant to their studies. But it collapses when confronted with an accurate definition of race and the most basic evidence of racial reality. The irony is that the idea that race is not real has itself been socially and politically constructed during the last several decades.

The following newspaper article from 1996 shows this process of construction and many of the race denial arguments and techniques, with my comments in brackets:<sup>11</sup>

WASHINGTON — Thanks to spectacular advances in molecular biology and genetics, most scientists now reject the concept of race as a valid way to divide human beings into separate groups. [What “spectacular” advances? Genetic studies show the validity of race, and other sources claim that “most scientists” accept that validity.] Contrary to widespread public opinion, researchers no longer believe that races are distinct biological categories created by differences in the genes that people inherit from their parents [Argument number one above. Not inherited from parents? No scientist is quoted as saying this.] . . . “Race has no basic biological reality,” said Jonathan Marks, a Yale University biologist . . . Instead, a majority of biologists and anthropologists, drawing on a growing body of evidence accumulated since the 1970s, have concluded that race is a social, cultural and political concept based largely on superficial appearances. “In the social sense race is a reality. In the scientific sense, it is not,” said Michael Omi, a specialist in ethnic studies at the University of California at Berkeley. [Argument number seven]

The idea that races are not the product of human genes may seem to contradict common sense. [Races not the product of genes? As in the similar statement above, no scientist is quoted as saying this.] “The average citizen reacts with frank disbelief when told there is no such thing as race,” said C. Loring Brace, an anthropologist at the University of Michigan. “The skeptical layman will shake his head and regard this as further evidence of the innate silliness of those who call themselves intellectuals.” [The preemptive argument, number 13 below]

The new understanding of race draws on work in many fields. “Vast new data in human biology, prehistory and paleontology . . . have completely revamped the traditional notions,” said Solomon Katz, an anthropologist at the University of

Pennsylvania. This is a switch from the prevailing dogma of the 19th and much of the 20th century. During that period most scientists believed that humans could be sorted into a few . . . inherited racial types [The obsolescence argument, number six above] . . . As recently as 1985, anthropologists split 50-50 when one of their number, Leonard Lieberman of Central Michigan University, asked in a survey if they believe in the existence of separate biological races . . . As a sign of the change, Lieberman said most anthropology textbooks published in this decade [the 1990s] have stopped teaching the concept of biological race . . . [T]he revised concept of race . . . reflects recent scientific work with DNA . . . “We are beginning to get good data at the DNA level,” said a Yale geneticist, Kenneth Kidd . . . [which] “support the concept that you can’t draw boundaries around races.” [The continuum argument number five above]

The Marxist ideological tradition is the logical source of this contention. This Marxist connection is given further support by the ethnic dynamics of race denial. The victims of race denial are the European races, and especially the Northern European race. It is they, and only they, who are actually threatened with dispossession and destruction by multiracialism, a process assisted by race denial. The beneficiaries of race denial, those who want to “abolish the white race”—in the terms of Noel Ignatiev, a long-time Marxist-Jewish activist for both Marxism and the destruction of the European races under cover of the Marxist theory that races are social classes rather than biological populations—are non-Europeans. Their classic Marxist revolutionary goal is to overthrow, dispossess, destroy, and replace the European race, and in Marxist fashion they define it as a social class, socially constructed, rather than a race. Their class enemy, the oppressive and privileged “social class” that they want to abolish, is the “white” race. In the context in which they use the term, “white” refers only to the European peoples, and especially the Northern European peoples. There always was an ethno-racial agenda behind Marxism, and the Marxist-Jewish promoters of that agenda have caused great harm to the European peoples over the last century.<sup>12</sup> Noel Ignatiev proves that this anti-Northern European Marxist racial agenda is still operating against the interests of the Northern European race.

Since the 1960s the racial agenda of Marxism, and the Marxist political “left,” has become more obvious. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century the “left” identified the aristocracy and “bourgeois capitalists” as the “class enemies,” “exploiters,” or “oppressors” to be overthrown by revolution and destroyed. In the late twentieth century it increasingly targeted the “white” race as the enemy, as an oppressive and evil racial elite that must be overthrown by any means necessary. Consistent with this view, the “left” has revealed a distinctly anti-Northern European bias, causing it to single out the Northern European race for marginalization, devaluation, dispossession, and extinction. By the end of the 1960s this bias had become explicit, as illustrated by the following account concerning the militant Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society:

I remember going to the last above ground Weatherman convention, and sitting in a room and the question that was debated was, "Was it or was it not the duty of every good revolutionary to kill all newborn white babies." At that point it seemed like a relevant framing of an issue, the logic being, "Hey look, through no fault of their own these white kids were going to grow up to be part of an oppressive racial establishment internationally, and so really your duty is to kill newborn white babies." I remember one guy kind of tentatively and apologetically suggesting that that seemed like it may be contradictory to the larger humanitarian aims of the movement, and being kind of booed down.<sup>13</sup>

By the end of the 1960s racial Marxism, focused on race rather than class, was explicit. Perhaps it was too explicit. So it sought cover by disguising itself in the classic Marxist jargon of class struggle, only now the class enemy was the "white" or Northern European race, redefined as a class. In defining the Northern European race, or "white" race, as a social class, racial Marxists theorized that the "white" race was politically and socially constructed by its position as a privileged and oppressive social class exploiting other classes that were socially defined as non-white. According to this theory the "white" race did not exist genetically or biologically, but only as a ruling social class. Those who were members of the ruling class were "white" while those who were not members were non-white. By this theory the "white" race only exists when there is another class defined as non-white that is politically and socially below it that it rules and oppresses. Also according to this theory, the "white" race only came into existence when Europeans made contact with non-European peoples during their conquest and colonization of the Americas, and established themselves as a ruling political and social class over the native and other non-European peoples. The Europeans then became "white" and the non-Europeans became non-whites. The concept of race was then socially and politically constructed in the Americas to legitimize and secure the ruling position of the "white" social class.

This theory is blatantly simplistic in its reduction of race to two groups: "white" and non-white. The peoples of East Asia and Central Africa certainly regard themselves as different races, as do the native peoples of the Americas. But the racial Marxists cannot admit any differentiation other than "white" and non-white. To do so would refute their definition of race as socially constructed classes. Also, the European races did not change biologically, genetically, or racially in the sixteenth or seventeenth century Americas when and where they began to exist in close contact with other races for the first time. European-Americans of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were not biologically, genetically, or racially different from their pre-sixteenth century European ancestors, or from their European contemporaries. Twentieth century Irish-Americans were not biologically, genetically, or racially changed from their pre-sixteenth century Irish ancestors, or from their contemporaries in Ireland. The dialectic of racial Marxism claims the "white" race only came into existence with the colonization of the Americas by Europeans in the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But what historical race inhabited Europe in the Middle Ages and before if not the “white” race, the biological ancestors of the people now classified as “white?” If this were simply a matter of semantics, with racial Marxists using the term “white” for class rather than race, and using other terms for racial classification, their argument would have some credibility. But what they say is that race is socially and politically constructed, that this began in the Americas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and then spread to Europe and the world.

It can be argued that the awareness of human racial differences began in the Americas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the different races first came into contact. But the different races existed, were real, long before they came into contact with each other. The contact did not create the races. It created awareness and knowledge of the different races, and that led to the study and classification of race. Contrary to the theories of racial Marxism, America did not create race, nor did it give race to Europe. America created multiracialism, different races living together in close contact in the same territory, and in the second half of the twentieth century multiracialism spread to Europe, largely through the efforts of the racial Marxists. In the America of previous centuries the existence of different social classes based on race restricted and slowed the process of racial intermixture that is the logical consequence of multiracialism. But in the second half of the twentieth century, largely through the efforts of the racial Marxists, the social class barriers between the races that restricted intermixture were attacked and largely removed, making it possible for the full consequences of multiracialism—Northern European racial destruction through intermixture—to be realized. Race denial is part of this process of Northern European racial destruction, conceptually destroying the Northern European race to promote its physical destruction.

The social and political construct argument is not about social class but about race. It is not about science, but about politics—racial politics. It did not originate from any scientific discovery, but from the rise of multiracialism and the racial transformation it is causing. It is not motivated or driven by scientific interests, but by the ethno-racial interests of the rising non-European groups. Those who make this argument are not destroying or abolishing a social class. They are trying to abolish or destroy the Northern European race.

Race is biological, a creation of genetics, biology, nature, and life. It is biologically constructed through evolution by the same process of divergence that has created all the diversity of other life forms. The legal status of being a citizen of a multiracial country is politically and socially constructed, a creation of men and their laws rather than of biology and nature. This is nowhere more evident than in a mass multiracial naturalization ceremony in which a racially mixed group of applicants becomes naturalized citizens. The applicants of

different races can change their citizenship and national status by a simple legal procedure. But their race is determined by their genetic inheritance from their ancestors, and cannot be changed.

8. *The argument that the individual variation within populations is greater than the variation between the averages of the different populations or, put another way, that most human variation occurs between individuals rather than races.* This is another attempt to minimize the significance and value of racial differences. But it compares extremes with averages, and the traits it compares are not the traits that are racially definitive, not traits that characterize any real geographic population, not the traits by which we identify races and distinguish them from each other.

9. *Argument by intimidation.* This is often the first method of argument, in hopes that the opponent will cower and retreat before a verbal onslaught of insults, threats, and accusations, and that a substantive argument will not need to be made. If it fails, and the more substantive argument also fails, the race denier often reverts to it as the argument of last resort.

10. *Argument by distortion.* Race deniers frequently distort, falsify, or misrepresent the arguments for the reality of race, including racial definitions and systems of classification, in part to create a strawman that can be easily refuted, and in part simply to cause confusion.

11. *One-sided argument.* This is the milieu in which race denial thrives and in which it has been promoted, an Orwellian intellectual milieu of de facto censorship in which the arguments of racial denial are stated as simple fact and no counterargument, challenge, or rebuttal is permitted. Given that many, if not all, of the race denial arguments are fallacies that could be easily refuted, this is probably also the milieu required for race denial to succeed. The above newspaper article is an example of this technique, making many questionable statements that are not questioned because the report is completely one-sided.

12. *Begging the argument.* The theater advertisement mentioned at the beginning of this essay is an example of this, the claim that the reality of race has to be denied in order to end racism. According to this argument, those who believe in the reality of race are perpetuating and abetting racism and giving aid and comfort to its practitioners. If one is opposed to racism and wants to end it, this argument begs, one must deny the reality of race. As forensic scientist George Gill observes:

Those who believe that the concept of race is valid do not discredit the notion of clines . . . Yet those with the clinal perspective who believe that races are not real do try to discredit the evidence of skeletal biology. Why this bias from the "race denial" faction? This bias seems to stem largely from socio-political motivation and not science at all. For the time being at least, the people in "race denial" are in "reality denial" as well. Their motivation (a positive one) is that they have come to believe that the race concept is socially dangerous. In other words, they

have convinced themselves that race promotes racism. Therefore, they have pushed the politically correct agenda that human races are not biologically real, no matter what the evidence.

Consequently, at the beginning of the 21st century, even as a majority of biological anthropologists favor the reality of the race perspective, not one introductory textbook of physical anthropology even presents that perspective as a possibility. In a case as flagrant as this, we are not dealing with science but rather with blatant, politically motivated censorship.<sup>14</sup>

13. *Preemptive or anticipatory argument.* As in the quote of C. Loring Brace in the above newspaper article, this technique anticipates the normal reaction to the argument and preempts it by stating it first. This advance statement is simply presumed to refute the anticipated reaction, although it does not actually address or answer it.

14. *Argument from authority.* When attempting to convince people that what they see with their own eyes is not real, does not exist, and is not to be believed, it helps to be supported by supposed experts and authorities who are presumed to have superior knowledge of the subject. Hans Christian Andersen's story "The Emperor's New Clothes" is the classic description of this technique, and the growing denial of the reality of race, supported by statements from scientists who are the supposed experts and authorities, proves that he did not exaggerate. The above newspaper article is an excellent example of this technique. Yet much of the racial denial by the scientific community is intellectually dishonest. Scientists still study race at the genetic level, only they do not use the word "race," using the word "population" instead. The geographic populations they study, which they prefer in native and unmixed (i.e., racially pure or distinct) form, are of course races, and have been referred to as races for centuries. But modern scientists do not study racial phenotypes, the traits that identify and define race, that are race, and therefore should not be regarded as experts or authorities on racial typology or identification. Their ability and knowledge in this area may be no greater than that of the average person. Yet one does not need to be an expert to recognize race by phenotype. Everyone does it, including the scientists who say that race is too ambiguous to recognize. All of us racially identify every person we look at, automatically, unintentionally and involuntarily. This is natural, a simple fact of nature. We all have the important ability to recognize our own kind and distinguish it from other kinds. Given the focus of this ability, it is very accurate at distinguishing our own kind, or race, from other races, and less accurate at distinguishing other races from each other. We know our own kind, our own race, best. This is where the so-called ambiguity of racial identification by phenotype is found. But the people of other races are able to distinguish their own race from other races with great accuracy. Their racial identification is not ambiguous to them, but as distinct and real as our race is to us.

The scientists who deny the accuracy of racial typology use it to racially identify people in their everyday lives, outside of their specialty, as much as the rest of us. So why the denial of something they have done all their lives? Why the claim that what they do all the time cannot be done? Most of the same scientists who now deny the reality of race made no such denial, and found no difficulty or ambiguity in racial identification, twenty or thirty years ago. So what has changed? What has happened to cause the scientifically recognized races of thirty years ago to now be denied? What discovery or addition to knowledge has proven that race does not exist? What proof was and is required for the reality of race, and why? What is the standard for race to be real, by what definition of race, and who set that standard and definition? It seems that the supposed experts about race are trying very hard to be ignorant of race, to know nothing about race, to deny race, to make themselves believe that race does not exist. So why the concerted effort to not see what is plain to all, to be racially blind? Why the exercise in scientific obscurantism? Is it because racial identification by phenotype is not a product of scientific study, and remains outside of science because scientists have not developed a scientific version of it that accounts for all the complexities of racial reality? Is it because decades of exhortations to practice racial blindness, and to be literally racially blind, are having their intended effect? Is it because the multiracialization of school and college classrooms and faculties, as well as of the news media and most of the workplace, has made recognition of the reality of race, and the racial tension and division it causes, socially and politically intolerable? Is it a logical consequence of the racial revolution and transformation of the West that began in the 1960s, and of the growing power, influence, and de facto control and domination of the rising non-Northern European ethno-racial groups? Or is it a matter of ethno-racial self-interest for some, as it is for Noel Ignatiev and was for Franz Boas before him, and political self-interest for others, as it was for the Emperor's experts in the Andersen story? It is probably all of these, some more than others. But regardless of the denials of certain scientists of questionable motive, competence, and integrity, the existence and reality of race is a creation and fact of nature, not science. Race existed long before science. Its existence is not dependent on science, but will continue with or without science, whether science defines it accurately or not. Those who see reality for themselves know that the scientists who deny the reality of race are wearing no clothes, despite all their scientific and expert claims to the contrary.

### CONCLUSION

Before racial denial became the lead argument for opponents of Northern European racial preservation, their main argument was the claim that the Northern European race was mixed rather than "pure," and that because of this racial mixture and impurity, it was not worthy of preservation. Of course, these were the same people who were advocating more, in fact total, racial

intermixture and impurity for the Northern European race, not the opponents of intermixture who wanted to prevent it in order to preserve the race. Also, of course, they did not describe the nature or extent of the intermixture they were referring to, nor provide any definition or standard of what constitutes racial “purity” and what level of it is required to justify racial preservation. Their arguments for racial impurity were, and are, as ambiguous as the arguments for racial denial. The answer to them was, and is, the same as the answer to the race deniers who claim that race is not real and does not exist, and that there is thus nothing there to preserve. I tell them that I love and want to preserve my race as it is, to preserve what is as it is, whatever that might be, and whatever they might call it. Whether they call it a race or not, or pure or not, it is the population and associated phenotypes that many want to preserve. And they know what I am talking about. On an operative level, they know what my race is as well as I do, and it is as real for them as it is for me. The difference is that what some racial empiricists seek to preserve, they want to destroy.

Race denial should not be regarded as an isolated phenomenon. It is very much a product of its times. It can only be properly understood in the context of the racial revolution and shift in ethno-racial power of the last half century. It is part of the ethno-racial offensive against the Northern European race that is destroying the Northern European peoples racially, genetically, and biologically by multiracialism and racial intermixture. The existence that it denies is the existence that it is helping to destroy. As a recent paper on genetic studies that affirms the reality of race informs us:

Geographic isolation [i.e., racial separation] and in-breeding (endogamy) due to social and/or cultural forces over extended time periods create and enhance genetic differentiation [i.e., create and preserve races], while migration and inter-mating reduce it [i.e., multiracialism and racial intermixture destroy races].<sup>15</sup>

Race denial is more than a fallacy. It is more than the sum of the many fallacies, the false arguments, used to support it. It is not an end in itself but a means to an end. It serves a purpose. Race deniers beg their argument with the claim that belief in race leads to racial oppression and genocide, so the purpose of race denial is to end racial oppression and prevent genocide. Actually the reverse is true. The real purpose of race denial is not to prevent genocide, but to prevent racial preservation, specifically the preservation of the European races, and most specifically the Northern European race. In short, the real purpose of race denial is not to prevent genocide but to help cause it. The true motive and intent behind race denial is to promote and assist the racial dispossession, replacement, and destruction of the Northern European race. Race denial, and every race denier, is against racial preservation, and specifically against the preservation and continued existence of the Northern European race.

Ironically, race denial is racially motivated. Its source and base of support is among the non-European ethno-racial groups. It is they who seek the dispossession, replacement, and destruction of the Northern European race, even in its ancient homelands. It is they who benefit from it, they who are the dispossessors and replacements. The existence of the other races is not threatened by race denial, so they can promote it from a position of racial immunity. It is the European races, and only the European races, and above all the Northern European race, who are threatened with extinction, and whose destruction is assisted by racial denial. Race denial is anti-Northern European in the most extreme sense of the term, as against the very existence of the Northern European race. Thus race denial is itself a part of the racial competition, and a product of the racial dynamics, the racial dialectic, of multiracialism and the process of racial destruction that it promotes. It might appear to be a political phenomenon, with political motives, but it is actually a racial phenomenon, with racial motives—motives much stronger and deeper than politics, which is only the means to serve racial ends. It serves as a cover for those racial ends. It hides the process of racial destruction behind the protective cover of a false dogma that says that the race being destroyed does not really exist, thus nothing real is being destroyed, and there is no valid reason to resist or oppose the destruction. But the race that is being destroyed, the population and its traits that the race deniers are trying or helping to destroy, are real, and they are mine. They are the object of my love and devotion, the center of my concern. They are all the people of Northern European ancestry and type, in their many millions, whose existence is being denied, and under the cover of that denial is being destroyed.

---

*Richard McCulloch is the author of **The Racial Compact** (1994), **The Nordish Quest** (1989), **Destiny of Angels** (1986), and **The Ideal and Destiny** (1982).*

---

## END NOTES

1. See Glayde Whitney's review of *The Emperor's New Clothes: Biological Theories of Race at the Millennium* by Joseph L. Graves, Jr., in the Winter 2001 issue of *The Occidental Quarterly* (Vol. I, No. 2). Graves's claim that race is not real is explicitly motivated by his opinion that the belief in race is an obstacle to "social justice" and the elimination of racism.
2. The substance of some of these exchanges can be found on my website at [http://www.racialcompact.com/reality\\_of\\_race.html](http://www.racialcompact.com/reality_of_race.html).
3. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/first/gill.html>. Dr. George W. Gill is a professor of anthropology at the University of Wyoming. He also serves as the forensic anthropologist for Wyoming law-enforcement agencies and the Wyoming State Crime Laboratory.

4. The methodology that shows a human-chimp genetic difference of about 1.6 percent shows a genetic difference of less than 0.2 percent between the human races. Feng-Chi Chen of National Tsing Hua University in Taiwan and Wen-Hsiung Li of the University of Chicago (2001) put the human-chimp gene difference at only 1.24 percent. Prof. Roy Britten of the California Institute of Technology, using a very different methodology, puts the figure at 5.4 percent (2002). This raises the obvious question regarding the difference between the human races using this same methodology: Would it also be more than three times as great?

5. Masatoshi Nei and Arun K. Roychoudhury, "Evolutionary relationships of human populations on a global scale," *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, Sept. 1993 (pp.927-943): <http://www.molbioevol.org/cgi/gca?sendit=Get+All+Checked+Abstract%28s%29&gca=10%2F5%2F927>.

It is unfortunate that no Scandinavian (Swedish, Danish, or Norwegian), Slavic, or Arab populations were included in this study, and that the English, German, and Italian groups were not divided into regions. It is possible that an east English group would be genetically closer to a Danish or northwest German group than to a west English group.

6. These genetic studies are based on nuclear DNA, the genes that are actually responsible for racial variation. Other studies of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA), such as that of Jody Hey and Eugene Harris (1999), show a difference between the human races that is about 4 percent of the difference between humans and chimpanzees.

7. <http://genomebiology.com/2002/3/7/comment/2007/>, Neil Risch et al., "Categorization of humans in biomedical research: Genes, race and disease," *Genome Biology* 2002 3(7): comment 2007.1-2007.12. Published 1 July 2002. This article is an excellent scientific summary of the evidence from genetic studies for the reality of race.

8. [http://anthro.palomar.edu/vary/vary\\_2.htm](http://anthro.palomar.edu/vary/vary_2.htm). This is a tutorial page on the website of the Behavioral Sciences Department of Palomar College, San Marcos, California, authored by Dennis O'Neil. Paloma College is a public two-year community college with about 30,000 students. The views expressed on this page are probably representative of what most social science students are currently taught about race. This should have probably been a predicted and expected result of multiracial education, with its chilling effect on racial research, where racial truth is the first casualty.

9. John R. Baker, *Race*, Oxford University Press, p. 100.

10. Risch et al., "Categorization of humans in biomedical research."

11. Robert Boyd, "Scientists: Idea of Race is Only Skin Deep," *The Miami Herald* (Oct. 13, 1996), p. 14A.

12. For a detailed examination of this subject see Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements*, Praeger, 1998.

13. Doug McAdam, in "Picking Up the Pieces," part 5 of the PBS series *Making Sense of the Sixties*, televised January 23, 1991. It can be assumed that in the context of this racial Marxist debate at the Weatherman convention it was understood that the term "white" did not include Jews.

14. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/first/gill.html>.

15. Risch et al., "Categorization of humans in biomedical research."